

July 2004

LITERATURE REVIEW FOR SCHOOL-BASED STAFF DEVELOPERS AND COACHES

By Terry Greene

NSDC's School-Based Staff Developer Learning Community Coach.

“Coaching is the act of helping someone--through expanding awareness and sharing experience — leverage their talents to do/be/have something *much* faster than they could do alone. And the benefits of becoming a coach are personal as well, impacting not only our client’s personal development, relationships, business, and life satisfaction, but your own as well.” (www.cvcommunity.com web site, “Become a Coach”)

The paragraph above comes directly from an internet web site called “Coachville” that promotes itself as a training site for coaches. In business, coaching is becoming increasingly more popular (Whitmore, 1992; Thomas, 1995). The goal of coaching is for personal growth and reflection. Rarely does the coach have a background in the business where they are coaching. It is the responsibility of the client to identify specific issues for growth.

On the other hand, in education, coaching is a way to support growth and move teachers toward using new instructional strategies and knowledge about teaching/learning. Unfortunately, few published research studies provide us with documentation of the impact of coaching on student achievement. In 1975, Berman and McLaughlin discussed the role of assistance to teachers within their own classroom as well as peer observation as a component of successful change programs. In studying curriculum implementation, Fullan and Pomfret (1977) noted the important role of administrative support and training.

Support is growing for coaching as the way to increase or enhance a teacher’s understanding of the complexities of teaching and learning. Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin report that “effective professional development is . . . sustained, on-going, and intensive, supported by modeling, coaching, and collective problem solving around specific problems of practice” (p. 203). Costa and Garmston (1994) and Garmston and Wellman (1999) report that coaching teachers in their practice is the most powerful means to increase their knowledge and improve their practice.

Purpose for the Literature Review

This document provides a review of literature supporting the position of School-Based Staff Developer/Coach. For depth, a variety of topics and resources related to the scope of the School-Based Staff Developer/Coach position will be reviewed and

annotated. Examining a variety of topics and resources is necessary for several reasons. While the position of School-Based Staff Developer/Coach has been implemented in some districts for as many as five to eight years, very little published documentation/data exists detailing the “how to’s” and research-based benefits of the position. However, even without a plethora of documentation and data, the position is widely discussed within the professional development community and the U.S. Department of Education as “the way” to enhance teacher quality.

With the implementation of Reading First, the early literacy component of No Child Left Behind, coaches are mandated as part of the professional development requirements for each grant. Specific data-gathering procedures are also required. It is hoped that states and districts will use the data gathered for the purpose of providing the professional community with data about the impact of coaching on student achievement.

Due to the various types of implementation of the position across states and school districts, the scope of the School-Based Staff Developer/Coach is wide and varied. To adequately discuss the position, it is necessary to examine all facets related to the position as this literature review and bibliography will attempt to do.

Definition of Terms

Within the educational community, a coach-type position may have many different names. The professional literature describes forms of coaching to include technical coaching, collegial coaching, challenge coaching, team coaching, cognitive coaching, peer coaching, mentoring, and lead teachers. Joyce and Showers (2002) state “technical coaching, team coaching, and peer coaching have in common . . . a concern for learning and implementing innovations in curriculum and instruction, whereas collegial coaching and cognitive coaching appear to aim more at improving of existing practice and repertoire” (p. 90).

Poglinco, Bach, Hovde, Rosenblum, Saunders, and Supovitz (2003) suggest that “technical coaching is typically used to transfer new teaching practices into teachers’ regular repertoires. Collegial coaching is used to increase teachers’ professional dialogue and help them reflect on their work. Peer coaching is commonly defined as two or more professional colleagues working together to improve their professional knowledge and skills. Mentoring relationships between experienced and novice teachers are also often described as coaching” (p. 2).

Costa and Garmston (2002) discuss the various terms for services that support teachers in improving instruction as consulting, mentoring, peer assistance, catalyst, supervision, coaching, and evaluation. Coaching, collaboration, and consulting are part of the instructional improvement process. Evaluation is performed by administrators and supervisors with the focus on the assessment of teacher performance. In consulting, experienced and knowledgeable teachers have been assigned as consultants, mentors, or peer coaches. Mentoring usually describes the support between an experienced teacher and a novice teacher, or a teacher who needs assistance in improving their teaching because of performance issues. In collaborating, peers work together to achieve a specific

goal through problem solving, planning, or reflecting. Cognitive coaches focus on the cognitive processes and are skilled at using the tools of that model.

Sweeney (2003) uses the terms “instructional coach” or “coach” to describe the support person who models new strategies in her classroom and then provides feedback when she begins to use the new strategies. Instructional coaches observe teachers and provide feedback; provide demonstration lessons that include time for planning, the lesson itself, and debriefing after the lesson; and co-teaching which also includes planning, the lesson itself, and debriefing. “Instructional coaches customize professional development to match each teacher’s needs and interests while they help the school establish a common understanding across all teachers” (p. 50).

In mathematics education, West and Staub (2003) call their model “content-focused coaching.” In this model, “. . . teacher and coach collaboratively plan, teach, and reflect upon classroom lessons. This collaboration is designed to provide teachers with individualized, adaptive, and situation-specific assistance focused on content, pedagogy, and student learning” (p xxi). In literacy instruction, Walpole and McKenna (2004) use the terminology “literacy coach” and suggest that “. . . literacy coach is a learner, a grant writer, a planner, a researcher, and a teacher. Literacy coaches are people who are directing continual school improvement work at the state, district, and school levels” (p. 20).

Lyons and Pinnell (2001) use a variety of terms for support personnel who work with teachers in literacy instruction. The researchers discuss staff developers becoming coaches and staff developers involved in “coachable moments, coaching sessions, preparing for coaching, coach for shifts in behavior, coaching conversations, coaching situations, etc.” They state “coaching is a way to help teachers become more analytic about their work” (p. 111) and that coaching supports the classroom teacher as she applies knowledge, develops skills, polishes technique, and deepens her understanding” (p. 237). The term “literacy coach” or “coach” is also used to describe a person who analyzes teaching through a sequence of actions that are useful in working with teachers. Teacher educator or literacy coach is also used to describe those who have the skills that teachers need to analyze levels of learning for teachers and students. The researchers also use the term “literacy coordinator” to discuss the role of the person whose “primary role is to analyze the teacher’s current understanding, observe instructional interactions, and select examples to expand the teacher’s craft and her understanding of theory” (p. 236). Literacy coordinators are also involved in coaching sessions.

Robb (2000) states “Collaborating with an expert, such as a coach or lead teacher, is a satisfying way to learn because together you build, clarify, and refine new and innovative teaching practices” (p. 59). Coach and lead teacher are used interchangeably here. Later, Robb refers to the Winchester Public Schools where the superintendent and director of instruction combined the role of coach and peer partner to develop a position called “lead teacher.” The two administrators wanted experienced classroom teachers to have the opportunity of a leadership role in the elementary schools. As opposed to a

coach, lead teachers were required to provide progress reports to the administration yet worked with teachers on a voluntary basis.

Cognitive Coaching

Cognitive Coaching is the one of the most structured and formal models to date to support teachers engaged in studying teaching and learning through coaching. In the early 1970s, a group of California educators met with the goal of developing strategies that would support administrators in the application of humanistic principles into the evaluation of teachers. By 1985, continued interest in cognitive coaching led to the formation of the Institute for Intelligent Behavior and in 1994, the first edition of *Cognitive Coaching: A Foundation for Renaissance Schools* was published.

Cognitive Coaching “is a simple model for conversations about planning, reflecting, or problem solving. At deeper levels, it serves as the nucleus for professional communities that honor autonomy, encourage interdependence, and produce high achievement” (Costa & Garmston, 2002, p. 5). Through a set of “skills, capabilities, mental maps, beliefs, values, and commitments” (p. 6), cognitive coaching supports the examination of a teacher’s own professional practice through the self-examination of “familiar patterns of practice and underlying assumptions that guide and direct action (p. 5).” Cognitive Coaches pose questions designed to guide teachers in changing their perceptions which is a prerequisite to changing their classroom behavior.

Within the framework of the Cognitive Coaching services that are designed to improve instruction, four categories exist: evaluating, collaborating, consulting, and Cognitive Coaching. “Three of these functions, coaching, collaboration, and consulting, interact to improve instructional practice. . . These three functions plus the periodic evaluations of teacher performance based on adopted teaching standards, lead to increases in student learning” (Costa & Garmston, 2002, p. 9).

Within many districts, consulting comes in the form of mentors, consultants, or peer coaches whose main job is to provide expertise in some/many/specific areas to other teachers. Collaborating focuses on people working together to satisfy the requirements of reaching a certain goal. A cognitive coach is a person who is trained “in using the tools, maps, beliefs, and values of mediation . . . to support a teacher in self-directed learning while improving instruction . . . a cognitive coach helps another person take action toward his or her goals while simultaneously helping that person to develop expertise in planning, reflecting, problem solving, and decision making. These are the invisible tools of being a professional, and they are the source of all teachers’ choices and behaviors” (Costa & Garmston, 2002, p 13).

Studies of Cognitive Coaching

Studies of Cognitive Coaching document its effectiveness in creating self-directed learners which is a major goal of the program. Edwards and Green (1997) documented that teachers trained in Cognitive Coaching as compared with a control group, spent more hours involved in professional development workshops both during the school day and

after-school. More importantly, researchers were able to document that “trained” teachers also used more new instructional strategies than “untrained” teachers.

In another study focused on the opportunity for professional growth as a part of Cognitive Coaching, teachers with two to four years of experience, matched with a control group, indicated that with the coaching they had more opportunities for growth in their teaching practices over a seven-month period (Krupan, 1997.) Along that same line, Awakuni’s research with teachers trained in Cognitive Coaching using it over a year’s time were found to have used more new teaching and assessment strategies with their students.

Additional research studies of Cognitive Coaching are related to the model’s Five States of Mind. One of the major goals of Cognitive Coaching is the concept of holonomy which is the “state of being simultaneously a part and a whole.” The paradox of both being part and whole produces tension and this tension is resolved through the Five States of Mind which are independence, craftsmanship, efficacy, flexibility, consciousness, and interdependence.

Cognitive Coaching and Teacher Efficacy

One of the most researched areas of Cognitive Coaching is that of teacher efficacy directly related to the teacher’s ability to resolve complex problems. Studies point to benefits for students based on improvements in teacher efficacy. “Research indicates that teachers with robust efficacy are likely to expend more energy in their work, persevere longer, set more challenging goals, and continue in the face of barriers or failure” (Costa & Garmston, 2002, p. 127).

Rosenholtz (1989) reported that teachers who reported more confidence and certainly in their own knowledge had students who made more progress in reading. The knowledge or personal efficacy that teachers feel influences student’s acquisition of basic skills. Fullan’s work highlights teacher efficacy as a variable in the success of implementation in the change process. “Some teachers, depending on their personality and influenced by their previous experiences and stage of career, are more self-actualized and have a greater sense of efficacy, which leads them to take action and persist in the effort required to bring about successful implementation” (Fullan, 1991, p. 77).

In the Rand Corporation’s examination of school effectiveness, the most consistent variable to affect school success was teacher efficacy but in a collective venue. The link described was that of teacher’s perception of goals that are valued and the idea that the goals can be reached through their participation in an organization (Berman & McLaughlin, 1977). In their research, Poole and Okefor (Winter, 1989) found a relationship exists between teacher efficacy and interactions in curriculum implementation. When teachers work together with a focus on their teaching tasks, new curriculum guides are used significantly more than when teachers worked alone even when the teachers studied had a greater sense of efficacy.

Cognitive Coaching and the Impact on Students

Research studies of Cognitive Coaching indicate that it benefits students. In a three-year study, Cognitive Coaching was used as was nonverbal classroom management and monthly dialogue groups as a way to support teachers in the implementation of standards-based education. Examining the scores of treatment and control groups of students, improvements were noted on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills in:

- Total ITBS Score and Integrated Writing Total Score between year 1 and 3;
- Math Advanced Skills and Integrated Writing Advanced Skills between year 1 and 2 and 1 and 3; and
- Math Total Score between years 1 and 2.

While the scores of control groups did improve over time, improvements in the treatment scores were higher than the control groups. Another finding in the same study noted highlighted teachers in the treatment groups who used Cognitive Coaching referred fewer students to special education compared with teachers in the control group (Grinder, 1996).

Additional studies by McCombs (1995) found that for senior high school teachers who had been coached for one year as part of the Cognitive Coaching program, instruction included more higher-level thinking as measured on the Encouragement of Higher Order Thinking Skills scale of the Teacher Survey. McLymont and da Costa (1998) found that Cognitive Coaching-trained teachers found implemented a classroom atmosphere of trust and supported more independent decision making for students.

Cognitive Coaching and Teacher Growth

Research on the Cognitive Coaching model also supports the impact on teacher growth. Teachers who participated in Cognitive Coaching were more satisfied with teaching as a professional when compared to the teachers in the control group without Cognitive Coaching (Edwards & Newton, 1994). Teachers in a three-year study using Cognitive Coaching reported increased satisfaction with teaching as a profession and their positions when compared to the control group (Edwards et al, 1989).

In another study of college professors who had 42 hours of Cognitive Coaching training, maximum improvement was noted in their ability for self-perception, increased self-confidence, and a greater enthusiasm for teaching (Garmston & Hyerle, 1988).

In the work of Edwards et al (1989), teachers in the treatment group grew in teacher professionalism and goal setting over the control group as measured by Saphier's School Culture Survey. Those same teachers in the treatment group also worked at a higher level of rapport with others and participated in more coaching opportunities.

Peer Coaching

"In general, training is expected to result in sufficient skill that practice can be sustained in the classroom and transferred into the working repertoire. As we continue to experiment with the design of coaching, *the major purpose of peer coaching remains the implementation of innovations to the extent that determination of effects on students is possible*" (Joyce & Showers, 2002, p. 83).

In 1980, Sharan and Hertz-Lazarowitz studied a professional development model where a faculty had extensive training in new teaching strategies and was supported through the use of “consultant-assisted self-help teams of three to four teachers. The teams engaged in cooperative planning of teaching processes and content, mutual observation of teaching, and feedback by teammates” (Joyce & Showers, 2002 p. 84). In the second year of follow-up, Sharon and Hertz-Lazarowitz noted that 65% of the teachers were using the new teaching strategies with regularity.

Joyce and Showers studied Sharon and Hertz-Lazarowitz (1980) and were impressed with their research due to the length and depth of the initial training and the consistent nature of the in-class follow-up, particularly the quality of peer support. Joyce and Showers hypothesized that continued classroom support, in some form, was critical for the addition of new teaching strategies to existing repertoires. They designed studies to investigate the impact of continued assistance in the form of coaching following initial training of new content. Their findings indicated that the “continued technical assistance, whether provided by an outside expert or by peer experts, resulted in much greater classroom implementation than was achieved by teachers who shared initial training but did not have the long-term support of coaching” (Joyce & Showers, 2002, p. 85).

Coaching Facilitating the Transfer of Training

The early research of Joyce and Showers demonstrates that coaching facilitates the transfer of training in the following ways:

- Classroom teachers and principals who were coached practiced the new content/strategies more frequently and gained greater skill in their use than un-coached teachers and principals who had the same amount of initial training (Showers, 1982 a, b).
- Teachers who had been coached used the new content/strategies in a more appropriate way in terms of instructional objectives and specific teaching models than the un-coached teachers. This appropriate use may be due to the discussion and sharing of materials, teaching objectives, etc. that coaches provided to the teachers (Showers, 1982 a, b; 1984, a, b).
- Teachers who had been coached had greater long-term retention of the new content/strategies and showed an increase in the use of the new strategies over time than un-coached teachers (Baker and Showers, 1984).
- Teachers who participated in peer coaching explained their new content/strategies to their students so that students would understand the purpose of the new strategy and the expected behavior when using the new strategy (Showers, 1984, a, b).
- Teachers who had been coached demonstrated clear cognition as to the purpose and use of the new strategy (Showers, 1982, a, b; 1984, a, b).

Changes to the Original Model

In the mid 1980s, Joyce and Showers moved to thinking about school improvement and the transfer of training through coaching to whole school initiatives in the change process. They have adjusted their model to address their whole school focus.

Peer coaching happens in teams that involve the whole school as opposed to a pair of teachers. The definition of coach has evolved to mean that “when teachers coach each other, the one teaching is the ‘coach’ and the one observing is the ‘coached’” (Joyce & Showers, 2002, p. 89). The idea behind the evolved definition speaks to the idea that when peers observe each other, the teacher observing is doing so to learn about the strategy that is under implementation and they are learning from their observation of the teacher teaching.

Additionally, there is no technical feedback after the observation as was originally part of the model. Feedback has been dropped from the peer coaching model in favor of the new goal of collaborative planning. In the implementation of new strategies, time is needed for planning so that working collaboratively, teachers can share each other’s lessons and units of study.

Future Thoughts for Coaching in the Change Process

Joyce and Showers suggest ways that staff developers can help teachers and schools. One suggestion for peer coaching study teams is the continued focus on collaborative planning while moving the teams into the monitoring of the implementation of the new content/strategies under study and the subsequent determination of the effect of the new strategy on students. “Measuring the impact of the planned changes in the educational program is of critical importance to any school improvement and change effort” (Joyce & Showers, 2002, p. 93).

Content-Focused Coaching

The intent underlying content-focused coaching is providing teachers with coaches who are experienced in the classroom and have deep content-area knowledge so as to provide situation-specific support customized for each teacher. “In content-focused coaching, theory-based conceptual tools assist coaches and teachers in deciding what to focus on in coaching conversations and how to guide such conversations. A framework for lesson design and analysis, a set of principles of learning, and a set of core issues mathematics lesson design help coaches guide teachers thinking in relation to the highly complex tasks of lesson design and classroom teaching” (West & Staub, 2003).

The content-focused coaching model is similar to other coaching models in that the coach and teacher have a pre-lesson conference; then observe, teach, or co-teach a lesson; and then have a post-lesson conference. What is different about content-focused coaching is the use of the theory-based conceptual tools, that is, the framework for lesson design, the set of principles of learning, and the set of core issues in mathematics. The framework of lesson design and analysis is based on the concept of teaching as “mindfully making use of curriculum” (West & Straub, p. 5). Within the framework, lesson design takes place at the intersection of “What is the curricular content to be learned by the students?” and “How is this content to be taught?” Two more questions complete the framework, “Why is this specific content to be taught?” and “Why will it be taught in this particular way?”

The set of nine principles of learning “succinctly captures pivotal theories of learning and teaching that are believed to be relevant for an educational system designed to enable all students to achieve a high level of performance” (West & Straub, p. 9). The principles were proposed by Lauren Resnick (Resnick 1995 a, b) and further extended by the Institute for Learning (Resnick & Hall 2001). Two examples of the principles include clear expectations and academic rigor in a thinking curriculum.

So that conversations between the coach and teacher reach that content-specific level, an additional tool in the form of a Guide to Core Issues in Mathematics is available within Content-focused Coaching. “The idea for such a tool is based on a set of questions developed by Klafki (1958, 1995) that is meant to ensure that teachers’ long-term curricular and lesson planning is accountable to the underlying structure of the discipline, takes into account the learners’ prior experience and knowledge that are relevant to the learning goal at hand, and anticipates future contexts in which the knowledge to be learned may lead to useful applications” (West & Straub, p. 10).

Coaching in Literacy

Using a Framework for Coaching in Literacy Education

Lyons and Pinnell (2001) have developed a professional development framework for planning, problem solving, and coaching based on the processes in a learning spiral. “This framework is structured around a dynamic process that occurs whenever teachers take on new learning. It offers staff developers a way to think about their work, from gathering important information about teachers’ current understanding and the contexts within which they work to establishing a culture of analysis and reflection about teaching and learning” (p. 1).

The framework consists of 10 basic processes, like assessing the context and providing the basics, that are defined in a recursive learning spiral for multiple use in order to teach different approaches to instruction. The learning spiral is designed for use in both classrooms and professional development sessions although some of the basic processes are more specific to coaching, like coaching for shifts in behavior and coaching for analysis and reflection.

The framework begins with coach’s decisions about the specific new procedure/strategy to be introduced. The coach then engages the group in an explicit demonstration and moves on to other levels on the spiral. The types of coaching activities used match each teacher’s needs. “You may decide to coach a group of teachers in guided reading for several weeks and focus class sessions and readings on that topic. But your in-class assistance will vary from one teacher to another. In one classroom, you might work on organization and selection of books; in another classroom, you might observe lessons and help the teacher use prompts effectively. The classroom is where you individualize your teacher education program. That is why coaching is so important” (Lyons & Pinnell, 2001, p. 20).

Gradual Release of Responsibility Model in Learner-Centered Professional Development

Sweeney (2003) states, “As educators, we are used to taking into account the diverse needs in a classroom of children, but the needs of adult learners are quickly forgotten. Adult learning is too often reduced to pulling together hundreds of teachers to listen to an expert pontificate on a given subject” (p. 3).

Pearson and Gallagher (1983) are credited with developing the gradual release model of learning. The researchers discussed this model in the context of reading comprehension instruction. Basically, within the gradual release model, learning begins with the teacher demonstrating and modeling a strategy or instructional process. During the demonstration, the teacher “thinks aloud” about the use of the strategy or process while actually working with a text. The students then practice using the strategy or process, with teacher support, working in pairs or small groups or with the teacher. After practice and on-going support provided by the teacher or peers, the strategy or process is internalized for students to use independently.

Sweeney (2003) contends that learner-centered professional development provides teachers with opportunities to move through the same gradual release model beginning with modeling and demonstrating. “In this stage, the teacher observes exemplary instruction by participating in classroom observations, receiving coaching, watching professional development videos, and reading and discussing descriptions of effective instruction. The goal in this phase is to offer a visual picture of high-quality instruction. Next, the teacher practices the approach that was previously modeled. In this phase, an instructional coach may teach alongside the teacher to offer feedback. Or teachers may participate in peer observations, meet in teams to discuss implementation of new teaching strategies, examine student work, or determine next steps in instruction” (p. 4).

Intentional Teaching Model and Reflective Coaching

Rock (2002) discusses the Intentional Teaching Model that is the underlying support for job-embedded professional development and reflective coaching. “By intentional, we’re referring to the ideal type of instruction within this model — teaching that is purposeful and reflective. This framework and its four components (conditional for learning, instructional planning, instructional deliver, and the teacher’s role) guided all decisions regarding professional development strategies within a school” (p. 1).

The implementation for the model took place in seven elementary schools in the Chicago Public Schools. Based on the reading component of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, students in schools that implemented this model increased their scores in a range from 7% to 70%.

The three parts of the reflective coaching model include planning, where the coach and teacher work together; execution in which the teacher and reflective coach teach the lesson and gather information about learning outcomes, student mastery, and engagement, etc; and reflection in which the reflective coach mediates the conference where the teacher summarizes the lesson, determines effectiveness of the lesson, etc.

Coaching in Study Groups and Book Clubs

Leading discussion is also a role and function of the instructional coach, according to Sweeney (2003). An example that Sweeney uses from her own background includes the instructional coach who decided that “if teachers weren’t trying new things in their classrooms, maybe they would learn from talking with people who were” (p. 42). The instructional coach provided opportunities at faculty meetings where the format was changed in order to spend time talking about instruction. The instructional coach also began to facilitate weekly grade-level planning meetings where time was devoted to instructional strategies, assessment, and the analysis of student work.

Walpole and McKenna (2004) also see that coaches, in their case, literacy coaches, provide professional development in the form of book clubs and study groups. The researchers suggest that both are important and differ from other forms of professional development due to the fact that teachers are required to do something before the meeting — like read the book, article, etc. The collegiality established by group members provides ways in which teachers and coaches work together as learners discussing their connections to the text and reflections around teaching and learning. This idea of teachers and coaches working together as learners is also consistent with Vacca and Padak’s (1990) research which found that coaches who were perceived as “knowing it all” were ineffective in building wide change models.

Coaching and Five Models of Professional Development

Often coaches have no idea about how to get started working with teachers and building quality professional development programs. Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1990) identified five models of professional development which provide a beginning point for coaches. The five models include:

- The individually guided model where teachers are involved in designing and putting into place their own program.
- Observation and feedback where teachers receive data about their own practice which could be used for their own improvement.
- The curriculum/development model where a specific issue or problem is identified and teachers work together through curriculum design and implementation to solve the problem.
- The training model where a goal is identified and support/training are provided to reach the goal.
- The inquiry model where teachers choose an area of interest and then design a model to investigate it.

Walpole and McKenna (2004) suggest that literacy coaches working with adult learners will need to use all five models in designing an effective professional development program. “A comprehensive system will include mechanisms for individual support, informed by observation and feedback, all designed to develop curriculum and to train teachers to implement it, in a context of inquiry about the effects of the total program on teachers and children” (p. 187). Vacca (1989) supports this idea of a

comprehensive system and adds that professional development should be conducted at the building level based on specific goals related directly to the teachers' daily work in a collaborative atmosphere.

Robb (2000) believes "Collaborating with an expert, such as a coach, or lead teacher, is a satisfying way to learn because together you build, clarify, and refine new and innovative teaching practices. . . . Coaching Kathleen (another teacher at the school) and teaching with her provided countless opportunities for both of us to grow through conversations about children, books, managing a reading-writing workshop, and teaching strategies — and that's the purpose of the coaching relationship" (p. 59).

According to Robb, teachers who coach should continue to work in their own classrooms as they have a greater understanding of the needs of students, curriculum, and instruction that way. "In addition to having teaching expertise, it's crucial for a coach to be able to accept a teacher where she or he is, find common talking points to build a trusting relationship, then help the teacher travel to other places" (p. 60).

Coaching in America's Choice Schools

In the America's Choice Schools, with administrator support, coaches were responsible for the implementation of literacy workshops. The implementation also included the introduction of the New Reference Performance Standards. Even though coaches and principals were trained separately, the sessions were supposed to reinforce each other. The training of the coaches was arranged in several multiple-day sessions throughout the year, but only one session was provided before the coaches began working with teachers in their respective schools. Each elementary school was staffed with two coaches while each middle school had one coach. Coaches also received additional support throughout the school year from their cluster leaders. The support usually came in the form of monthly meetings. The cluster leaders and schools were also supposed to conduct a collaborative "review" of the implementation twice a year.

Each school was to begin the implementation with Writers' Workshop in the fall followed by Readers' Workshop in the spring. The implementation process began with each coach developing a model classroom where demonstration lessons and skills were practiced for six weeks in collaboration with the model classroom teacher. At the end of six weeks, coaches move to a demonstration classroom where strategies are modeled for other classroom teachers on that grade level for about three weeks. Each coach is also responsible for observing the teachers as they implement Readers'/Writers' Workshop and provide feedback about appropriate implementation.

Supporting the model and demonstration classrooms are study groups, all-staff meetings, and teacher meetings. The principal usually led the all-staff meetings with coach input; teacher meetings were designed to take teacher understanding and confidence in using the standards and workshop to some depth; and study groups focused on the review and study of research and materials to further the acquisition of content knowledge.

The data to be analyzed in the America's Choice Schools included observations of teachers and coaches in classrooms as noted by an observation scale developed by the researchers and post observation interviews with the coaches, teachers, and the principal of each school. The final sample consisted of 71 observations in 27 schools. Interviews were then analyzed and organized into broad thematic areas.

Conclusions drawn from the data included (Poglinco, Bach, Hovde, Rosenblum, Saunders, & Supovitz, 2003):

- Overall, teachers were very positive about the individual support provided by the coaches and the modeling/demonstrations in their own classes. Even teachers who had been critical of the coach and instructional materials provided by America's Choice were still positive about the coach's in-class modeling.
- Teachers who had co-taught or planned with the coach had more positive reactions to working with the coach.
- Coaches were seen as more supportive of teachers when there had been frequent informal contacts made by the coach.
- Teachers who had a strong initial reluctance to having the coach come into their classrooms were mostly situations where the coach had not spent the time or had the opportunity to sit and plan with the teacher before the in-class modeling.
- Teachers also felt the in-class modeling they received was only as good as the coach's instructional expertise.
- Other teachers reported that the coach talked a lot about standards in the meetings but the lesson modeled by the coach had not incorporated any reference to standards.
- Some teachers discussed the timing of the in-class modeling as an issue when the modeling happened later in the school year because they had already set up their routines at that point.
- "The importance of instructional modeling rests on the fact that it appears to be an effective instructional tool . . . Seeing the coach demonstrate in the classroom had an important effect on how teachers subsequently modified their practice . . ." (p 21).
- The amount of joint planning that took place between teachers and coaches seemed to depend in large part on the personality of the coach, the style of the coaching and the overall approach taken to coaching.
- Some of the coaches developed a practice whereby they would model a strategy for a teacher, then co-teach the strategy with the teacher, and then observe the teacher using the strategy. Many of these coaches also practiced joint planning with teachers, too.
- Most coaches were responsive to teachers who requested observations. Some factors that seemed to restrict coaches in providing observations were lack of time, teacher resistance, scheduling conflicts, and individual classroom demonstrations.

- There was much more informal and out-of-class coaching — before and after school, at lunch, at recess, in lunchroom, and just walking around — happening than was expected.

Several concerns were raised. Both teachers and principals were concerned about teachers who viewed in-class modeling as a sort of “free time” and were not engaged in an active participatory role. There were also concerns about the risk of dependency by the teachers on the coach because several teachers felt the coach alone should develop the lessons or lesson ideas for in-class modeling and did not see the value of collaboration for students involved in the lessons.

Conclusion

Most of the research studies available present a promising view of the effectiveness of coaching as a venue for improving instructional quality. It should also be noted that a few studies show that coaching showed no effect on instructional improvement (Gutierrez, Crosland, & Berlin, 2001; Veenman, Denessen, Gerrits, & Kenter, 2001). However, literature is lacking on the impact of coaching on student achievement or even a relationship between coaching and student learning.

There is agreement in the field that improving teacher quality and supporting instructional change requires effective professional development that must be multi-dimensional, research- and theory-based, on-going including demonstrations/modeling of strategies and skills, supported by coaching on the job site, and providing specific feedback. (Guskey, 2000; Joyce & Showers, 1995; Joyce, Shower, & Bennett, 1987; Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989). Researchers also agree that some type of on-going specific follow-up is critical in supporting teachers in the practice necessary to integrate new knowledge and skills into classroom practice and sustain the practice over time with depth of understanding (Guskey, 2000; Garet et al, 2001).

Useful Tools for Coaching

In support of School-Based Staff Developer/ Coach, one goal of this literature review and annotated bibliography is to provide resources for use on the job. Below is a listing of annotated resources to provide a variety of information for successful School-Based Staff Developer/Coaches.

Cambourne, Brian (1988). *The whole story, natural learning and the acquisition of literacy in the classroom*. Auckland, New Zealand: Ashton Scholastic.

Cambourne provides a comprehensive model of learning for literacy that is easily applicable to the needs of adult learners and provides the context for demonstrating instructional strategies as a part of the learning process. Cambourne is helpful to understand a framework of support for learning and what strategies need to come before and after demonstrations. His model is really a model of gradual release of responsibility.

Costa, Arthur L. & Robert J. Garmston (2002). *Cognitive coaching, A foundation for renaissance schools*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

The book details in depth the Cognitive Coaching model. The appendix includes good tools that could be useful in organizing for classroom observations and conversations. Costa and Garmston provide great information on the “how to’s” of coaching and would be helpful overall.

Fullan, Michael G. & Suzanne Stiegelbauer (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed). New York: Teachers College Press.

Part II: Educational Change at the Local Level provides six chapters written from different perspectives — teacher, principal, student, district administrator, consultant, and parent and community — that are key pieces of reading for School-Based Staff Developer/Coaches on the job. The different perspectives provide the “big picture” context for working with all stakeholders in an initiative.

Guskey, Thomas G. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Useful guidelines for evaluating professional development programs can be found in Chapter 3. All of the information in the text is relevant for coaches implementing quality professional development programs.

Hall, Gene E. & Shirley M. Hord (2001). *Implementing change, patterns, principles and potholes*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

The book is divided into four parts: Context for Implementing Change, Tools and Techniques for Change Facilitators, Imperative for Leadership Change, and Constructing and Understanding the Different Realities of Change. The book provides much useful information as it extends and enhances the ideas presented in *Taking charge of change* (SEDL, 1998). The chapter on Innovation Configuration mapping provides comprehensive information in writing maps that describe “what it looks like” for teachers and administrators involved in implementation of instructional initiatives.

Hord, Shirley M., William L. Rutherford, Leslie Huling-Austin, & Gene Hall (1998). *Taking charge of change*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model as a tool for working through the change process is presented. This book provides highly useful tools to support School-Based Staff Developer/Coaches in looking at adult learners who are dealing with change and implementation. Levels of Use and Stages of Concern are critically important tools. Innovation Configuration Maps are also introduced as a highly useful tool for professional development and classroom visits.

Joyce, Bruce & Beverly Showers (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

The authors provide an in-depth overview of their model of peer coaching over time and including newest changes in their model. Case studies are also provided.

Killion, Joellen (2002). *Assessing impact: Evaluating staff development*. Oxford, Ohio: National Staff Development Council.

Powerful text and the only “voice” in the area of assessing the impact of professional development on student achievement that a School-Based Staff Developer/Coach could pick up and design an in-depth assessment plan based on the steps listed in the text. Very useful model for assessment.

Killion, Joellen, Linda Munger, Pat Roy, & Parker McMullen (2003). *Training manual for assessing impact: Evaluating staff development*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

This book includes a companion CD with PowerPoint slide presentation and participant handouts to provide professional development for the ideas and knowledge presented in *Assessing impact: Evaluating staff development* (NSDC, 2002). Critically important tool for professional development of all stakeholders involved in teaching and learning.

Lyons, Carol A. & Gay Su Pinnell (2001). *Systems for change in literacy education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

The text is divided into four sections with one full section devoted to coaching and professional development. References to literacy coaching throughout the other sections as well. Many sample forms and other artifacts from professional development area included. The text provides the reader with much depth- in information for professional development and literacy education.

Murphy, Carlene U. & Dale W. Lick (1998). *Whole-faculty study groups: A powerful way to change schools and enhance learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

The text is in-depth and gives a complete look at all facets of study groups. School-Based Staff Developer/Coaches who facilitate study groups or who need information about working with adult learners will find the book very helpful.

Robb, Laura (2000). *Redefining staff development*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Robb provides an overview of the model of professional study in the context of her experience as a literacy coach and other vignettes to illustrate her concepts. Chapters are included that address coaches, lead teachers, and peer partners. Sample forms are also included in the appendix.

Rock, Heidi Marie (2002). Job-embedded professional development and reflective coaching. *The Instructional Leader*, 5(8), p. 1-4.

Rock provides an overview with her model of reflective coaching based on the Intentional Teaching Model

Sweeney, Diane (2003). *Learning along the way: Professional development by and for teachers*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Sweeney divides her book into three parts: Modeling and Observing, Guided Practice, and Independence. The text is full of situations and conversations from her role as a literacy coach. She provides an overview of “the gradual release of responsibility” model for adult learning in the context of professional development and coaching.

Walpole, Sharon & Michael C. McKenna (2004). *The literacy coach's handbook: A guide to research-based practice*. New York: Guilford Press.

The authors provide a complete overview of literacy coaching including chapters on reading research, assessment, schedules, programs, leadership, and instructional support. While information about coaching is woven throughout all the chapters, a full chapter is devoted to the literacy coach as learner, grant writer, school-level planner, curriculum expert, researcher, and teacher. Sample forms are included throughout the text.

West, Lucy & Fritz C. Straub (2003). *Content-focused coaching, transforming mathematics lessons*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann and Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.

The book provides a complete overview and explanation of Content-Focused Coaching including sample forms to use. Case studies are provided that include excerpts of pre/post conference conversations and lessons. A set of three CDs are also included with the book and are intended to extend the information in the text with a full, rich description of the model.